

# Natural Resources Conservation Service

## Application Ranking Summary

### Hoosier Hills and Highlands Oak Restoration

<b>Program:</b>	<b>Ranking Date:</b>	<b>Application Number:</b>
<b>Ranking Tool:</b> Hoosier Hills and Highlands Oak Restoration		<b>Applicant:</b>
<b>Final Ranking Score:</b>		<b>Address:</b>
<b>Planner:</b>		<b>Telephone:</b>
<b>Farm Location:</b>		

#### National Priorities Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
If the application is for development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP), the agency will assign significant ranking priority and conservation benefit by answering "Yes" to the following question. Answering "Yes" to question 1a will result in the application being awarded the maximum amount of points that can be earned for the national priority category.	
1. a. Is the program application to support the development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP)? If answer is "Yes", do not answer any other national level questions. If answer is "No", proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section.	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Water Quality Degradation – Will the proposed project improve water quality by: (select all that apply)	
2. a. Implementing the practices in a Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CNMP)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. b. Implementing the practices in a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. c. Reducing impacts from sediment, nutrients, salinity, or pesticides on land adjoining a designated "impaired water body" (TMDL, 303d listed waterbody, or other State designation)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. d. Reducing the impacts from sediment, nutrients, salinity, or pesticides in a "non-impaired water body"?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. e. Implementing practices that improve water quality through animal mortality and carcass management?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Water Conservation – Will the proposed project conserve water by: (select all that apply)	
3. a. Implementing irrigation practices that reduce aquifer overdraft.	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. b. Implementing irrigation practices that reduce on-farm water use?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. c. Implementing practices in an area where the applicant participates in a geographically established or watershed-wide project?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. d. Implementing practices that reduce on-farm water use as a result of changing to crops with lower water consumptive use, the rotation of crops, or the modification of cultural operations?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Air Quality - Will the proposed project improve air quality by: (select all that apply)	
4. a. Meeting on-farm regulatory requirements relating to air quality or proactively avoid the need for regulatory measures?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. b. Implementing practices that reduce on-farm emissions of particulate matter (PM2.5, PM10)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. c. Implementing practices that reduce on-farm generated greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. d. Implementing practices that increase on-farm carbon sequestration?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Soil Health:– Will the proposed project improve soil health by: (select all that apply)	
5. a. Reduce erosion to tolerable limits (Soil "T")?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
5. b. Increasing organic matter and carbon content, and improving soil tilth and structure?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Wildlife Habitat – Will the proposed project improve wildlife habitat by: (select all that apply)	
6. a. Implementing practices benefitting threatened and endangered, at-risk, candidate, or species of concern.	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
6. b. Implementing practices that retain wildlife and plant habitat on land exiting the Conservation	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

Reserve Program (CRP) or other set-aside program?	
6. c. Implementing practices benefitting honey bee populations or other pollinators?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
6. d. Implementing land-based practices that improve habitat for aquatic wildlife?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Plant and Animal Communities: Will the proposed project improve plant and animal communities by: (select all that apply)	
7. a. Implementing practices that result in the management control of noxious or invasive plant species on non-cropland?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
7. b. Implementing practice in an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Energy Conservation– Will the proposed project reduce energy use by: (select all that apply)	
8. a. Reducing on-farm energy consumption?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
8. b. Implementing practice(s) identified in an approved AgEMP or energy audit, which meet ASABE S612 criteria?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
Business Lines – Will the practices to be scheduled in the “EQIP Plan of Operations” result in:	
9. a. Enhancement of existing conservation practice(s) or conservation systems already in place at the time the application is received?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

### State Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
If the application is for development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP) 106 Forest Management Plan or 112 Prescribed Burning Plan, the agency will assign significant ranking priority and conservation benefit by answering "Yes" to the following question. Answering "Yes" to question 1.1 will result in the application being awarded the maximum amount of points that can be earned for the local priority category.	
1. Is the program application to support the development of a Conservation Activity Plan (CAP) 106 Forest Management Plan or 112 Prescribed Burning Plan? If answer is "Yes", do not answer any other State Level questions. If answer is "No", proceed with evaluation to address the remaining questions in this section. (400 Points Max)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
State Level Ranking Questions	
1. Is the offered acreage ADJACENT TO a protected conservation area? Eligible areas include: Hoosier National Forest, Crane Naval Base, Federal/State wildlife refuges, forests, parks and nature preserves; Nature Conservancy lands; or other areas protected by a minimum 30 year easement with wildlife management objectives (for example: 30 year or permanent easements in WRP). Classified Wildlands and Classified Forest areas are not deed- restrictive easements, and therefore not considered protected conservation areas. Data layers available at F:\geodata\environmental_easements include: Easements Layer (easements_a_in.shp) Areas managed by IDNR (Managed_Lands_IDNR_IN.shp). Additional eligible data sources may be available at the local level. Note the source (Cons-6) if alternate data sources are used. (90 points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. Is the offered acreage LESS THAN 1 MILE FROM a protected conservation area? Data layers available at F:\geodata\environmental_easements include: Easements Layer (easements_a_in.shp) Areas managed by IDNR (Managed_Lands_IDNR_IN.shp). Additional eligible data sources may be available at the local level. Note the source (Cons-6) if alternate data sources are used. (80 points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. Is any of the offered land where the planned practices(s) will be applied located within either the Shawnee Hill or Highland Rim Natural Areas? Use data layer F:\geodata\project_data\ncrcs\Ranking_Layers\EQIP\2 017\Hoosier_Hills_Highlands.lyr to determine if the area(s) where practices will be applied fall within this area. (70 Points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. If there is an existing management plan written for this land, is “oak community restoration” identified as a landowner objective? 106 FMP, Stewardship Plan, a plan meeting 106 FMP criteria, or Fish and Wildlife CAPs are considered eligible plans if they include oak community restoration as an objective. (40 points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
5. Will the SCHEDULE OF OPERATIONS have a direct positive effect on a Threatened or Endangered Species? Answer “yes” if the project is identified by the Toolkit T&E tool (i.e. Bat Button), AND restores habitat that meets the requirements for program ranking criteria listed in the Toolkit hot-linked T&E guidance documents. Or will restore a rare oak community (such as glades/savannas) (20 points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
6. Does the application improve oak communities on woodlands by implementing Brush Management (314) (with Oak Communities restoration addressed in the management plan)? (10 Points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

7. Does the application improve oak communities on woodlands by implementing Forest Stand Improvement (666) focused on mid-story removal? (40 Points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
8. Does the application improve oak communities on woodlands by implementing Prescribed Burning (338)? (50 Points)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
9. Has the applicant had prior year contracts which were cancelled or terminated due to contract violation(s) within the past 3 program years? (-200 Points) A violation must be noted in the assistance notes, NRCS-CPA-13, NRCS-CPA-153, or Indiana Corrective Action Plan. A contract cancellation due to documented hardship does not meet these criteria.	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

#### Local Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
Award points based on the resource concerns being addressed in this application, relative to Local Work Group identified priority resource concerns for your county.	
1. Sheet, Rill, and Wind: Bartholomew, Crawford, Jackson, Putnam Habitat Degradation: Clark Excessive Bank erosion from streams, etc.: Floyd SQD - Organic Matter Depletion: Greene, Harrison Undesirable plant productivity and health: Brown, Lawrence, Monroe Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Orange, Perry Concentrated Flow: Dubois, Washington Ex sediment in surface waters: Martin, Morgan, Owen	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. SQD - Organic Matter Depletion: Bartholomew, Martin, Putnam Ex sediment in surface waters: Clark, Dubois, Perry Undesirable plant productivity and health: Crawford Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Floyd, Harrison Concentrated Flow: Jackson Inadequate livestock water: Lawrence, Monroe Inadequate Feed and Forage: Orange Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Greene, Washington Inadequate structure and composition: Brown Ex plant pest pressure: Morgan Ex bank erosion from streams, etc.: Owen	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Bartholomew, Dubois, Morgan Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Clark Concentrated Flow: Crawford, Harrison Ex plant pest pressure: Floyd, Greene, Lawrence, Perry SQD - Compaction: Jackson, Putnam Inadequate Livestock Water: Orange Ex Sediment in surface waters: Washington emissions of GHGs: Brown, Monroe Undesirable plant productivity and health: Martin, Owen	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. Habitat Degradation: Bartholomew, Brown Undesirable plant productivity and health: Clark, Harrison, Morgan, Orange, Perry SQD - Organic matter depletion: Crawford Ex sediment in surface waters: Floyd, Lawrence Ex bank erosion from streams, etc.: Jackson, Putnam Inadequate livestock water: Washington Ex plant pest pressure: Dubois Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Greene Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Monroe, Owen Inadequate structure and composition: Martin	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
5. Ex sediment in surface waters: Bartholomew, Greene Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Clark, Floyd, Harrison, Lawrence Inadequate Feed and Forage: Crawford Excess water - ponding, flooding, seasonal high water table, etc.: Jackson Concentrated Flow: Orange, Putnam Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Perry, Washington SQD - Compaction: Brown Inadequate livestock water: Martin Habitat Degradation: Dubois SQD - Organic matter depletion: Owen ex plant pest pressure: Monroe emissions of GHGs: Morgan	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
6. Ex plant pest pressure: Bartholomew, Brown, Clark Ex bank erosion from streams, etc.: Crawford Inadequate feed and forage: Floyd, Lawrence, Morgan SQD - Compaction: Harrison, Washington Undesirable plant productivity and health: Jackson Ex sediment in surface waters: Orange, Putnam SQD - organic matter depletion: Dubois Concentrated flow: Greene, Martin Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Monroe Inadequate livestock water: Owen, Perry	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
7. Ex bank erosion from streams, etc.: Bartholomew, Morgan, Washington Concentrated flow: Clark Ex plant pest pressure: Crawford, Owen WQD - Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters: Floyd Inadequate livestock water: Harrison Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Jackson, Putnam Ex pathogens from manure, bio-solids, etc.: Lawrence, Orange Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Brown Undesirable plant productivity and health: Dubois Ex water - ponding, flooding, seasonal high water table, etc.: Greene SQD - Compaction: Martin, Monroe SQD - Organic matter depletion: Perry	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
8. 14-digit priority watershed: Bartholomew (Driftwood) SQD - Compaction: Clark, Greene, Orange Ex sediment in surface waters: Crawford SQD - Organic matter depletion: Floyd, Jackson, Lawrence, Morgan Habitat Degradation: Harrison, Monroe, Putnam, Washington Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Brown Inadequate feed and forage: Martin Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters: Dubois, Owen Concentrated flow: Perry	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
9. Undesirable plant productivity and health: Bartholomew, Putnam SQD - Organic matter depletion: Clark, Washington Inadequate livestock water: Crawford, Floyd Ex plant pest pressure: Harrison, Orange	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

Habitat Degradation: Greene, Jackson, Morgan, Owen Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Dubois, Lawrence Ex sediment in surface water: Brown Inadequate structure and composition: Perry Ex nutrients in surface and ground waters: Martin Inadequate feed and forage: Monroe	
10. SQD - Compaction: Bartholomew Ex bank erosion from streams, etc.: Clark, Harrison Inadequate structure and composition: Crawford, Monroe Emissions of GHGs: Dubois, Floyd Ex sediment in surface waters: Jackson Habitat Degradation: Lawrence Sheet, rill, and wind erosion: Martin, Morgan, Orange Inadequate feed and forage: Washington Inadequate livestock water: Brown, Greene Energy - Farming/Ranching practices and field operations: Owen Ex plant pest pressure: Putnam Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters: Perry	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

**Land Use:**

Resource Concerns	Practices
-------------------	-----------

**Ranking Score**

Efficiency:  Local Issues:  State Issues:  National Issues:  <b>Final Ranking Score:</b>
--

This ranking report is for your information. It does not in any way guarantee funding. When funding becomes available, you will be notified if your application is selected for funding. Some changes to the application may be required before a final contract is awarded.

Notes:

<b>NRCS Representative:</b>	<b>Applicant Signature Not Required on this report for Contract Development unless required by State policy:</b>
<b>Signature Date:</b>	<b>Signature Date:</b>